UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,359	08/20/2003	Michael Joseph Darweesh	MSFT-2567/305144.1	6410

41505 7590 11/15/2006	EXAMINER
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)	CHOU, ANDREW Y

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/644,359	DARWEESH ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andrew Y. Chou	2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 August 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle,* 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/10/2003</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-23 have been examined. Claims 1, and 13 are the independent claims. The priority date recognized for this application is 08/20/2003.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The Office acknowledges receipt of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 11/10/2003. It has been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered by the examiner.

Oath/Declaration

3.   The Office acknowledges receipt of a properly signed oath/declaration filed on 08/20/2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5.   Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fuh et al. US 6,324,683 B1 (hereinafter Fuh).

Claim 1:

Fuh discloses a system (see for example FIG. 14, and related text) for debugging

a computer application that employs rights-managed (RM) content, the

application normally being instantiated in an isolated process with a trusted

component for performing RM services for the application including ensuring that

a debugger is not monitoring the isolated process, the system comprising:

a first, non-isolated process having the application and a shell version of

the trusted component (see for example FIG. 2, items 194, 181,183, and related

text), such shell version of the trusted component receiving each request by the

application for RM services, the first process for being monitored by the

debugger and the shell version of the trusted component in the first process

being unconcerned whether the debugger is monitoring the first process (see for

example FIG. 2, "SQL-request", and related text); and

a second, isolated process separate from the first process and having a

debugging version of the trusted component (see for example FIG. 1, and related

text), the shell version of the trusted component in the first process forwarding

the received request to the debugging version of the trusted component in the

second process, such debugging version of the trusted component in the second

process acting upon the request from the application in the first process, the

debugging version of the trusted component in the second process also ensuring

that the debugger is not monitoring the second process, the debugging version of

the trusted component in the second process being unconcerned whether the

debugger is monitoring the first process (see for example FIG. 4, "Debug

Engine", and related text),

whereby the debugger may monitor the application and the first process

even as the application and first process are employing the RM content (see for

example column 16, lines 27-43, "monitor and control application program", FIG.

4, item 411, and related text).

Claim 2:

Fuh further discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the debugging version of the

trusted component in the second process based on the acted-upon request

returns appropriate data, if any, back to the application in the first process by way

of the shell version of the trusted component in such first process (see for

example FIG. 5, and related text).

Claim 3:

Fuh further discloses the system of claim 1 further comprising the debugger

monitoring the first process and the application thereof (see for example column

16, lines 27-43, "monitor and control application program", FIG. 4, item 411, and

related text).

Claim 4:

Fuh further discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the application in the first

process includes an executable and the debugging version of the trusted

component in the second process includes a library of services available to the

executable corresponding to the application (see for example column 15, lines

44-54, "libraries").

Claim 5:

Fuh further discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the debugging version of the

trusted component in the second process is a library and the second process

requires an executable, and wherein the second process further has a shell

executable (see for example column 16, lines 28-43, "PDDA debugger").

Claim 6:

Fuh further discloses the system of claim 5 wherein the shell executable includes

no substantial functionality (see for example column 12, lines 59-67, "shell

command for invoking the "xldb" debugger").

Claim 7:

Fuh further discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the shell version of the

trusted component in the first process includes no substantial functionality (see

for example column 12, lines 59-67, "shell command for invoking the "xldb"

debugger").

Claim 8:

Fuh further discloses the system of claim 1 further comprising a debugging

manifest corresponding to the debugging version of the trusted component in the

second process, the debugging manifest including information therein relevant to

the debugging version of the trusted component and the second process, the

debugging version of the trusted component during operation thereof referring to

the debugging manifest for the information therein (see for example column 9,

lines 35-43, "debugging macro").

Claim 9:

Fuh further discloses the system of claim 8 wherein the information in the

debugging manifest is selected from a group consisting of a description of an

environment of the second process, a digital signature with a verifying certificate

chain, keys that are to be employed to verify constituent elements of the second

process, procedures to be followed by the debugging version of the trusted

component, and combinations thereof (see for example column 9, lines 35-43,

"debugging macro").

Claim 10:

Fuh further discloses the system of claim 8 wherein the information in the

debugging manifest restricts the debugging version of the trusted component in

the second process to allowing the application to employ debug RM content only

and not normal RM content (see for example column 22, lines 51-58).

Claim 11:

Fuh further discloses the system of claim 10 wherein debug RM content has a

digital signature associated therewith from a debug RM server and normal RM

content does not have such a digital signature associated therewith from a debug

RM server (see for example (see for example column 15, lines 30-44,

"signature").

Claim 12:

Fuh further discloses the system of claim 10 wherein debug RM content has a

digital signature associated therewith that derives from a debug root key and

normal RM content does not have such a digital signature associated therewith

that derives from a debug root key (see for example column 46, lines 46-5).

Claim 13:

Fuh discloses a method for debugging a computer application that employs

rights-managed (RM) content, the application normally being instantiated in an

isolated process with a trusted component for performing RM services for the

application including ensuring that a debugger is not monitoring the isolated

process, the method comprising (see for example FIGs. 2, 3, and related text):

the application and a shell version of the trusted component being

instantiated in a first, non-isolated process (see for example FIG. 2, items 194,

181, 183, and related text), the first process for being monitored by the debugger

and the shell version of the trusted component in the first process being

unconcerned whether the debugger is monitoring the first process (see for

example FIG. 2, "SQL-request", and related text);

a debugging version of the trusted component being instantiated in a

second, isolated process (see for example FIG. 1, and related text), the

debugging version of the trusted component in the second process ensuring that

the debugger is not monitoring the second process, the debugging version of the

trusted component in the second process being unconcerned whether the

debugger is monitoring the first process (see for example FIG. 4, "Debug

Engine", and related text),

the application in the first process receiving a request to render RM

content and in turn requesting the shell version of the trusted component to

assist in decrypting and rendering the content (see for example FIG. 12, step 495, and related text);

the shell version of the trusted component in the first process forwarding the request to the debugging version of the trusted component in the second process (see for example FIG. 2, "SQL-request", and related text;

the debugging version of the trusted component in the second process determining that the RM content is allowed to be rendered (see for example FIG. 12, step 495, and related text); and

the debugging version of the trusted component in the second process decrypting the RM content and returning same to the application in the first process for rendering thereby (see for example FIG. 12, step 495, and related text),

whereby the debugger may monitor the application and the first process even as the application and first process are employing the RM content (see for example column 16, lines 27-43, "monitor and control application program", FIG. 4, item 411, and related text).

Claim 14:

Fuh further discloses the method of claim 13 wherein the debugging version of the trusted component in the second process determining that the RM content is allowed to be rendered comprises the debugging version of the trusted component determining that the RM content is allowed to be rendered based on a license corresponding thereto (see for example column 27, lines 52-63).

Claim 15:

Fuh further discloses the method of claim 13 wherein the debugging version of

the trusted component and a debugging manifest corresponding to the

debugging version of the trusted component are instantiated in the second,

isolated process, the debugging manifest including information therein relevant to

the debugging version of the trusted component and the second process, and

wherein the debugging version of the trusted component in the second process

determining that the RM content is allowed to be rendered comprises the

debugging version of the trusted component determining that the RM content is

allowed to be rendered based on the information in the debugging manifest (see

for example column 9, lines 35-43, "debugging macro").

Claim 16:

Fuh further discloses the method of claim 15 wherein the information in the

debugging manifest restricts the debugging version of the trusted component in

the second process to allowing the application to employ debug RM content only

and not normal RM content.

Claim 17:

Fuh further discloses the method of claim 16 wherein debug RM content has a

digital signature associated therewith from a debug RM server and normal RM

content does not have such a digital signature associated therewith from a debug

RM server (see for example column 15, lines 30-44, "signature").

Claim 18:

Fuh further discloses the method of claim 16 wherein debug RM content has a

digital signature associated therewith that derives from a debug root key and

normal RM content does not have such a digital signature associated therewith

that derives from a debug root key (see for example column 15, lines 30-44,

"signature").

Claim 19:

Fuh further discloses the method of claim 13 wherein the debugging version of

the trusted component in the second process returns the decrypted RM content

to the application in the first process by way of the shell version of the trusted

component in such first process (see for example column 12, lines 59-67, "shell

command for invoking the ""xldb" debugger").

Claim 20:

Fuh further discloses the method of claim 13 further comprising the debugger

monitoring the first process and the application thereof (see for example column

16, lines 27-43, "monitor and control application program", FIG. 4, item 411, and

related text)..

Claim 21:

Fuh further discloses the method of claim 13 wherein the debugging version of

the trusted component in the second process is a library and the second process

requires an executable, and wherein the debugging version of the trusted

component and a shell executable are instantiated in the second, isolated

process (see for example column 15, lines 44-54, "libraries").

Claim 22:

Fuh further discloses the method of claim 21 comprising instantiating the shell

executable with no substantial functionality (see for example column 12, lines 59-

67, "shell command for invoking the ""xldb" debugger").

Claim 23:

Fuh further discloses the method of claim 13 comprising instantiating the shell

version of the trusted component in the first process with no substantial

functionality (see for example column 12, lines 59-67, "shell command for

invoking the ""xldb" debugger").

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Andrew Y. Chou whose telephone number is

(571) 272-6829. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00

am – 4:30 pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful,

the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam, can be reached on (571) 272-3695.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned is (571) 273 8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application

or proceeding should be directed tot eh TC 2100 Group receptionist whose

telephone number is (571) 272 2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private

PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll

free).

AYC

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER